

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Howard Washington v. M. Uddin, M.D.

Washington v. Uddin, No. 2:22-CV-2272-DC-DMC-P (E.D. Cal. July 24, 2025) · No. 2:22-CV-2272-DC-DMC-P · Decided July 25, 2025

SUMMARY

These Findings and Recommendations address Defendant M. Uddin’s unopposed motion for summary judgment in Howard Washington’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action concerning alleged deliberate indifference to serious medical needs following injuries to his left eye. The court concludes that the undisputed evidence does not establish deliberate indifference or causation attributable to Dr. Uddin and recommends granting summary judgment on the Eighth Amendment claim. It also recommends declining supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law negligence claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dennis M. Cota
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:22-CV-2272-DC-DMC-P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment and state-law negligence. Defendant moved for summary judgment. Plaintiff did not oppose the motion. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations that summary judgment be granted and that supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law claims be declined.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 when the pleadings and evidentiary materials show no genuine dispute of material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed the evidence and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, but required the nonmoving party to identify specific evidence establishing a genuine, material factual dispute.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Howard Washington v. M. Uddin, M.D.

TOPICS

prisoners rights summary judgment section 1983 cruel and unusual punishment civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights prisoner litigation constitutional law civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim based on an alleged delay in follow-up ophthalmic care.
2. Whether Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim based on changing and tapering his pain medication.
3. Whether the court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law negligence claim after disposition of the federal claim.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment should be granted to Defendant because the undisputed evidence showed no actionable delay attributable to Defendant and no evidence that any delay caused further injury.
2. Summary judgment should be granted to Defendant because the undisputed evidence did not show that changing Plaintiff's prescription to Tylenol 3 or tapering pain medication was medically unacceptable or undertaken in conscious disregard of an excessive risk to Plaintiff's health.
3. The court should decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law negligence claim because no federal claim remained.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide for summary judgment or summary adjudication when "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." (at 1)

"Where the record taken as a whole could not lead a rational trier of fact to find for the non-moving party, there is no 'genuine issue for trial.'" (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Washington received cataract surgery on his left eye on August 4, 2020, and was examined in follow-up on August 6. On August 9, while the eye was still healing, his cellmate struck him in the left eye, causing severe injury and loss of vision; he was taken the same day to UC Davis Medical Center for emergency surgery and

later follow-up care. Defendant Uddin obtained the outside medical records when they became available, ordered an urgent follow-up appointment, substituted formulary pain medication for Norco, and later tapered the medication after the plaintiff reported improved pain and the outside physician had prescribed narcotics for only one week. Plaintiff presented no opposition or evidence showing that Uddin delayed necessary care, caused further injury, or acted with deliberate indifference in managing pain medication.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court screened the complaint and allowed the action to proceed only on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment medical-care claim against Defendant Uddin; Defendant Lynch was dismissed. Defendant answered, discovery closed, and Defendant moved for summary judgment. The findings and recommendations recommend granting the motion and declining supplemental jurisdiction over any remaining state-law negligence claim, subject to objections and review by the assigned district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Mora v. ChemTronics*, 16 F. Supp. 2d 1192, 1200 (S.D. Cal. 1998)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323, 325 (1986)
- *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586-87 & n.11 (1986)
- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 251, 255 (1986)
- *T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pacific Elec. Contractors Ass’n*, 809 F.2d 626, 630-31 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Wool v. Tandem Computers, Inc.*, 818 F.2d 1433, 1436 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Richards v. Nielsen Freight Lines*, 602 F. Supp. 1224, 1244-45 (E.D. Cal. 1985), *aff’d*, 810 F.2d 898, 902 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 31 (1993)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832, 834, 837 (1994)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102, 105 (1976)
- *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 347 (1981)
- *Toussaint v. McCarthy*, 801 F.2d 1080, 1107, 1111 (9th Cir. 1986)
- *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1253 (9th Cir. 1982)
- *McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059-60 (9th Cir. 1992)
- *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1131-32 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- *Doty v. County of Lassen*, 37 F.3d 540, 546 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *Hunt v. Dental Dep’t*, 865 F.2d 198, 200 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Jackson v. McIntosh*, 90 F.3d 330, 332 (9th Cir. 1996)
- *Toguchi v. Chung*, 391 F.3d 1051, 1058 (9th Cir. 2004)
- *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472 (1995)

- WMX Techs., Inc. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc)
- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/howard-washington-v-m-uddin-m-d-syf3c91x>